

MILFORD PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING

October 20, 2015 Board of Selectmen’s Meeting Room, 6:30 PM

MINUTES APPROVED ON NOVEMBER 17, 2015

Members Present:

Christopher Beer, Chairman
Paul Amato
Steve Duncanson
Tim Finan
Janet Langdell
Veeral Bharucha, Alternate member

Staff:

Bill Parker, Community Development Director
Shirley Wilson, Recording Secretary

Excused:

Judy Plant
Susan Robinson, Alternate member

Perspective Alternate member

Douglas Knott

PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Per NHRSA 675:6, the Milford Planning Board will hold a public hearing for the **2016-2021 Capital Improvements Plan.**

MINUTES:

2. Approval of minutes from the 9/15/15 meeting.

NEW APPLICATIONS

3. **Leonard A. Golden, et al / Marilyn J. Piekarski, Trustee – Osgood and Mason Roads – Map 42, Lots 50-1, 50-2, & 55.** Public hearing for a lot line adjustment involving three (3) residential lots in the Residence R District. *(New application- Monadnock Survey, Inc.- tabled from 9/15/15)*
4. **Scott A. & Gwendolyn R. Krauss – Amherst St – Map 23, Lot 3.** Public hearing for a major subdivision creating three (3) new residential lots. *(Meridian Land Services)*
5. **Tammy J. Bole – Ruonala Rd – Map 52, Lot 83.** Public hearing for a minor subdivision creating one (1) new residential lot. *(Meridian Land Services)*
6. **Salt Creek Properties, LLC – South St – Map 43, Lot 20.** Public hearing for a minor subdivision creating one (1) new commercial lot. *(Applicant)*
7. **Robert Lamattina and Salt Creek Properties, LLC – Hammond Rd – Map 43, Lots 72 & 73.** Public hearing for a lot line adjustment. *(Sandford Surveying and Engineering)*
8. **Robert Lamattina/Tokyo Joe’s Studio – Hammond Rd – Map 43, Lot 73.** Public hearing for a site plan amendment to re-configure the parking area. *(Sandford Surveying and Engineering)*

9. OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Beer called the meeting to order at 6:30PM. He introduced the Board and staff and explained the ground rules for the public hearing. Veeral Bharucha, alternate member, was called to sit.

MINUTES:

J. Langdell made a motion to approve the minutes from the 9/15/15 meeting as presented. T. Finan seconded. S. Duncanson abstained and all else in favor. Vote 5-0-1; motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Per NHRSA 675:6, the Milford Planning Board will hold a public hearing for the 2016-2021 Capital Improvements Plan.

Chairman Beer recognized:

Paul Dargie, Committee Chairman

Bill Parker, Community Development Director

Mark Bender, Town Administrator

J. Langdell thanked the volunteer CIP subcommittee members who worked so diligently on this report; Paul Dargie, Joe Oneail, Gil Archambault, Judy Plant, Tim Finan, Matt Lydon, Veeral Bharucha and Bill Parker (staff support).

P. Dargie gave an overview of the process, prioritization and tax impacts. There are eight (8) projects selected for the 2016 warrant.

1. Bridges Annual Capital fund - \$350,000

There are nine (9) bridges in town that will need to be repaired or replaced in the near horizon. Altogether it will cost approximately \$9M to replace those nine (9) bridges and ancillary projects. In the past we've done bonds for each individual project, but we have changed to doing an annual capital fund of \$350,000 each year. Bridges could be \$500,000 to \$1M each so we might have to build up the reserve for a few years or solicit increased funding to do a major project. For smaller projects, several could be done at one time. The committee's stance is that we should safely postpone any replacements until we get the state funding, which they are currently not doing; however if a severe risk is determined and a bridge needs to get done, it would be replaced without that funding. J. Langdell inquired if the 80/20 funding was federal or state and when the timeframe would start up again. P. Dargie said it was state funding and then explained that the state is downshifting costs to the cities, towns and school districts. The official state position is that the money would become available in 2023. It remains to be seen whether that will happen or not. B. Parker added that this information was given to the committee by the DPW Director during his presentation. P. Amato inquired why a different tact was being taken for the bridges when it looks like next year we'd be looking to bond \$5M for the roads. P. Dargie said there is rationale for doing either way; capital reserve funds vs bonding and there is no right way. J. Langdell inquired if there was a significant impact to the tax rate relative to interest or operating costs between a capital reserve or a bond. P. Dargie said it is minimal in the current environment, either way. Taking \$350,000 from the taxpayers that may not be used for a while is not a lot in the scope of the overall \$9M problem. P. Amato stated that's the issue; we don't see a \$9M problem, we see a \$350,000 problem each year where on the roads we see a \$9M problem that we pay for over fifteen (15) years.

2. Loader, 2-3 CY Bucket - \$135,000

This is to replace a unit that is twenty (20) years old and will be a lease. It has been on the CIP for a long time and needs to get done.

3. Roads Catch Up Project - \$5,000,000

The Town has been spending roughly \$300,000 a year out of the operating budget for road repairs and the average condition of the roads has been declining for years. The Cartegraph system was used to physically analyze all the roads in town. We now have a good database of actual road conditions and we have an "Overall Condition Index" or OCI score for each segment of road. The higher the number the better the score. The roads are also classified by the number of cars that travel on each road. The vast majority of town roads are classified as *urban local*, but there are also a few *urban collector* and *urban arterial* roads. An OCI number of 65 is considered to be good, and using that number there is approximately \$4M worth of work that needs to be done on *urban local* roads and \$500,000 worth of work to be done on *collector* and *arterial* roads. We are proposing a catch up project to target all the roads that are scored below 65 and do various types of maintenance to bring those roads up

to a level greater than 65 and at the same time, increase the average spending per year from \$300,000 to some higher number, perhaps \$500,000 to maintain the improved roads. J. Langdell inquired about the driver for the spending increase; was it the cost of asphalt, manpower or degree of work? P. Dargie said we didn't talk about all the cost elements; DPW had an average cost to do various activities and \$500,000 may not be the right number but ultimately it will be the Selectmen that the budget together with some number. M. Bender stated that we've included \$500,000 in the 2016 budget as a starting point for discussion with the Selectmen and the Budget Advisory Committee. The driver of that is a combination of asphalt and other materials, as well as the scope of roadwork to be done. We could easily use \$750,000 but it is a matter of balancing it between what the taxpayers are accustomed to paying in the budget and the overall tax rate going forward. J. Langdell asked if that number was realistic to provide us with the resources to maintain these roads after we make a \$5M investment to bring the highest priority roads up to a level of 65%. M. Bender replied that's a decision that the Board and the Budget Advisory Committee will have to make considering the timeframe whether it will be three years or five years and the paving plans for both scenarios. It's hard to plan out beyond two years because road conditions are subject to change but we will have a lot of information available.

4. Addition to and Renovation of Wadleigh Memorial Library - \$5,108,000

This is basically the same plan that was on last year's warrant, only with an adjustment for inflation. This had the widest variation of priorities from first to last, so from the committee's perspective it ended up in the middle. It is a good solid plan.

5. Sidewalk Tractor/Plow with Sander - \$185,000

This replaces equipment that is currently not working and would be a lease.

6. Backhoe, Tractor Loader with Thumb Attachment - \$145,000

This would be a lease.

7. Truck, 36K GVW8CY, w/ Plow, Sander, Wet System - \$185,000

This is replacing a sixteen (16) year old piece of equipment.

8. Storm Sewer Video Inspection and Cleaning - \$172,800

This was on the ballot last year. The town is required to inspect all the storm sewers over a six (6) year period but by doing it all at once we get a special arrangement with NH DES where 20% of the principal is forgiven. If this doesn't pass, the plan will be to do a little each year.

Water/Sewer projects

All will be paid for by the water users.

1. Water Utilities (WTR14-01) – New Water Source – Phase 1 - \$520,000

2. Water Utilities (WTR15-01) – UV Disinfection Replacement - \$1,000,000

3. Water Utilities (WTR15-02) – Administrative Building HVAC Upgrades - \$250,000

Out year projects:

2017

1. Fire Department (FIRE11-01) – Upgrades to Downtown Station - \$2,000,000

The conceptual plan wraps a two story addition around the side and back of the existing building and renovates the existing structure. All improvements fit on the existing land.

2. Community Development (CD10-03)–Nashua St/Ponemah Hill Rd Sidewalks & Signalization-\$665,000

3. Public Works–Highway (DPWH12-03 –Truck, 36K GVW, 8 CY, w/Plow,Sander,Wet System-\$185,000

4. Water Utilities (WTR14-03) – New Water Source – Phase 2 - \$1,000,000

This project to construct and install the well could potentially have some funding from the town, perhaps a third of the cost. An extra water source will benefit the town in general.

5. Water Utilities (WTR15-03) – Clarifier Mechanism Replacement - \$1,500,000

2018

1. Ambulance (AMB14-01) – Replace 2001 Ambulance - \$229,250

The third ambulance would get them on a fifteen year life rotation where each ambulance would be the primary vehicle for five years, a secondary vehicle for five years and a ready backup vehicle for five years.

2. Community Development (CD11-02)–Osgood/Armory/Melendy Roads–Pedestrian & Bicycle Improvements-\$140,000. This project would only occur with the 80% federal funding.

3. Fire (FIRE14-01) – Replace Rescue 1 - \$675,000

4. Public Works–Recreation–Community Development (DPWR13-01) – Brox Recreation Fields - \$500,000

5. **Water Utilities (WTR15-04) – Dewatering Upgrade - \$1,000,000**
To be paid by water/sewer users.
6. **Water Utilities (WTR15-05) – Backup Generator Replacement - \$250,000**
To be paid by water/sewer users.

2019

1. **Public Works–Hwy (DPWH13-03)–8 CY 36,000 GVW Dump Truck w/ Plow,Sander,Wet System- \$195,000**
2. **Public Works – Transfer Station (DPWTS13-01) – Truck Rolloff for Transfer Station - \$185,000**
3. **Water Utilities (WTR15-06) – WAS Holding Tanks - \$1,000,000**
To be paid by water/sewer users.
4. **Water Utilities (WTR15-07) – MLE Process Upgrade - \$250,000**
To be paid by water/sewer users.

2020

1. **Fire Department (FIRE15-01) – Replace Engine 2 - \$650,000**
2. **Public Works (DPWH15-01) – Sicard Snow Blower - \$75,000**
3. **Water Utilities (WTR15-08) – Effluent Filtration - \$3,000,000**
To be paid by water/sewer users.
4. **Water Utilities (WTR15-09) – Influent Screenings Conveyor - \$100,000**
To be paid by water/sewer users.

P. Amato inquired about leasing options. P. Dargie said the lease/purchase is for 5 years, and afterwards we will own the equipment. Most equipment will last longer than 5 years and the lifespan for fire equipment is generally 15-30 years.

Projects on the horizon:

Administration – Town Hall Renovations

Public Works – Highway – Bridges Years 2021-2024

Fire – West End Fire Station

Public Works – Recreation – Keyes Park Improvements

Public Works – Solid Waste – Solid Waste Management Improvements/Transfer Station Upgrades

J. Langdell inquired if the pedestrian bridges were included in the projects. P. Dargie replied only the motor vehicle bridges are included in the \$9M.

School District:

2017

School District (SCH09-03) – Renovations District-Wide - \$ 5,000,000

2021

School District (SCH15-01) – Renovations District-Wide - \$5,000,000

The initial presentation from the superintendent was \$6.5M of projects that he thought were urgent, but we are paring it down from there. There are a host of items that go into that, mainly HVAC related equipment at the middle school.

P. Dargie explained the variations which include proposing a fifteen (15) year bond, which is a more realistic number, instead of a twenty (20) year bond for the roads because we don't want to go beyond the life of the roads. He then reviewed the tax impact table and said if all 2016 projects were approved in their proposed format we would go from \$1M in spending to \$2.7M before it starts to decline again. Total spending on principle and interest for capital projects almost triples in this horizon. Four (4) projects are the main cost drivers; the library, the roads catch up bond, the annual capital fund for bridges and the fire station. On the school side spending will go from \$1.1M annually to \$1.3M and then back down to \$600,000.

P. Amato said this seems like the longest time that we haven't needed a new school and to get spending down to \$200,000 without the new bond, is pretty amazing. P. Dargie noted that enrollments are declining and will continue to do so. The big change is that in 2020, the Heron Pond Elementary School will be paid off.

P. Dargie said combined, spending ramps up from \$2.2M to \$4M per year in 2018 and then back down to \$2.9M per year in 2021. On the town side, .82/\$1,000 assessed valuation goes up to \$2.11/\$1,000 and then back down to \$1.77/\$1,000. Total debt service for the school and town combined is currently \$1.69/\$1,000 of assessed valuation. That ramps up to \$3.09 and then back down to \$2.22. The town owes \$8M on principle and interest for a dozen bonds and leases. Water and sewer owe \$4M in principle and interest and the schools owe net of building aid \$6.8M; altogether open payments total \$18.7M.

Chairman Beer opened the hearing for public comment.

Kathy Bauer, Board of Selectmen, inquired about the age of the existing fire department building. P. Dargie replied that it was built in the 1970's. K. Bauer said it would be 43 years old when the station is scheduled to be upgraded.

Jennifer Hansen, Wadleigh Library Board of Trustees, noted that several of the Board members were here tonight to express our frustration with being fourth on the priority list. How did the committee determine the ranking? P. Dargie explained the process and showed the ranking spreadsheet. Each member ranked the individual projects and then those scores were averaged. There was a wide variation in the library's ranking and the average score was 4.4. J. Hansen stated that the ranking was essentially the opinion of the CIP committee and if it is the CIP committee's job to plan out big projects, when do we become #1. Is it even a possibility for the committee to give us a specific timeframe when we will be #1 and when will have the support of the CIP, the Budget Advisory committee and the Selectmen?

J. Langdell explained that it is not the job of the CIP committee to plan out big projects for the Town of Milford. This committee consists of a body of citizens that gathers information and knowledge based on input and presentations from the town and department heads to develop a planning tool that can help guide the decisions that are made by the Board of Selectmen. It is not the end all-be all plan for the town, it is a planning tool.

T. Finan added that the committee had a healthy discussion on whether or not to even do priorities. In general, I personally feel that if a project makes it to this year's list that means that the CIP committee is recommending that it go on the ballot by virtue that they made it to this year. The priorities are almost an adjunct to that and the main reason to rank is because this really is a tool to advise the Board of Selectmen or the Planning Board to help in their discussions. P. Amato noted that in the past, all projects that made it to the current year's CIP were ranked the same. The CIP committee looks at a broad spectrum and tries to keep the tax impact relatively the same; as things fall off, things go on. This plan however, has quite an increase and ultimately the people have to vote on it. I can see the library's frustration because the town really first needed a new police station, then a new ambulance facility and now the town needs roads and bridges; the Trustees have been very patient. J. Hansen reiterated everyone's frustration of having worked so hard and when we've come back year after year for decades. What will it take to become the highest priority? J. Langdell said everyone has to put this report into context and at this point in time it would appear that bridges and roads are a higher priority than other items. This is a slice in time report. I certainly understand where the library is coming from as well, but there are no guarantees that anything will be the one thing that Milford needs because it's fluid. T. Finan reiterated that he didn't like the priorities because in his eyes, it is the library's turn. In the past, it was a question of what year the project would be in or pushed out to and now you are here at the top; it is your time. There won't be anything in the Voters' Guide that states this was ranked #4 but this CIP report is a public document. Realistically I don't think a library would ever be ranked #1, but you are on the list of things we think can be done this year. I think you ought to downplay the priorities of the CIP committee, because what really counts is how the Selectmen and Budget Advisory Committee vote, that's what visible.

J. Langdell said it would be helpful to see an inclusion, as an appendix, of the summary of the votes and how the committee derived this priority with the rankings, categories, and how wide the margins were. The rankings do make a difference for this document. Anyways, it is public information. P. Amato said he wouldn't read that much into the priority of the committee and the Selectmen have to vote to put it on the ballot. J. Hansen said she feels the ranking does influence the Budget Advisory Committee and the Selectmen and ultimately the voters. C. Beer explained that the Selectmen instructed the CIP Committee to rank the projects. J. Hansen stated that the trustees are volunteers and we work tireless hours. When will we get our chance? S. Duncanson replied when the

voters vote for it. J. Langdell added that there is a very positive summary in the CIP report for this project and it is supportive. We've made a point of getting this committee's meetings televised to educate the public

Chairman Beer closed the public portion of the meeting.

S. Duncanson made a motion to adopt the 2016-2022 CIP Plan, without the additional appendix. P. Amato seconded. V. Bharucha, P. Amato, T. Finan, C. Beer and S. Duncanson voted in the affirmative. J. Langdell voted in the negative stating she felt the appendix should be included. She added that the committee did a great job and this is a wonderful report. Vote 5-1-0; motion carried.

J. Langdell inquired when the report would be posted on the website and if there were CIP meeting minutes on the website. B. Parker said the report would be posted when signed and he would check on the minutes.

NEW BUSINESS:

Leonard A. Golden, et al / Marilyn J. Piekarski, Trustee – Osgood and Mason Roads – Map 42, Lots 50-1, 50-2, & 55. Public Hearing for a lot line adjustment involving three (3) residential lots in the Residence R District.

C. Beer read the notice into the record and then email correspondence from Phil Tuomala dated 10/19/15 requesting the application be withdrawn without prejudice.

J. Langdell made a motion to withdraw the application for the lot line adjustments. S. Duncanson seconded. P. Amato abstained and all else in favor. Vote 5-0-1; motion carried.

Scott A. & Gwendolyn R. Krauss – Amherst St – Map 23, Lot 3. Public hearing for a major subdivision creating three (3) new residential lots.

No abutters were present.

Chairman Beer recognized:

Randy Haight, Meridian Land Services Inc.

Chairman Beer read the notice into the record and verified that the application was complete. P. Amato made a motion to accept the application. J. Langdell seconded and all in favor. B. Parker referenced the staff report and stated that because the town line does run through the property, the application has also been given to Amherst for the Planning Board to review. Amherst has submitted comments which are included on the staff report. J. Langdell stated that in this instance, regional impact has already been looked at and this in and of itself would not rise to the RSA's defined level of regional impact without that one piece of land in Amherst. She then made a motion that the application did not pose potential regional impact. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

R. Haight presented plans dated 9/15/15 and explained the proposal to subdivide the 2+ acre lot into four (4) lots. The new lots range from 19,000SF to 28,000SF and all exceed the minimum lot size. To comply with Milford frontage requirements, a small portion of lot 23/3-3 lies in Amherst and we have made application to the Amherst Planning Board who will hear it on 11/4/15. All development will occur in Milford and lots 2 and 3 will have a common driveway so that all driveways will be in Milford. The parcels will be serviced by municipal sewer and water, natural gas, and overhead electrical. We are proposing a 20ft sewer easement to utilize force mains for each of the lots and that will have individual E1 systems.

P. Amato inquired who would pay to put the sewer in. R. Haight replied that it will be decided at the time of building permit application and will be dependent on the use. It will be a private line within the easement on private property and access into a saddle or wherever the Water Utilities wants it to go.

Chairman Beer opened discussion to the public; there being none, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

J. Langdell suggested adding a note that these new lots were subject to impact fees.

S. Duncanson asked if authorization was required from Amherst. B. Parker referenced staff recommendation #3. J. Langdell contended that wasn't technically the same thing and she would want to know what revisions the town of Amherst was requiring, if any. R. Haight reiterated that there would be no activity or change in the lot in Amherst, so they are not acting on a subdivision only endorsing the plan by signing in the approval block. It can't be recorded until both Boards sign.

P. Amato made a motion to approve the application, subject to the following conditions from the staff report dated 10/20/15, that;

1. Prior to the signing of the subdivision plan, a note be added to the plan stating "Plans for municipal sewer service to be located in the proposed sewer easement to serve Lots 23-3-1, 23-3-2, & 23-3 shall be approved by the Water Utilities Dept prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for each lot."
2. Prior to the signing of the subdivision plan, all lot monumentation be set and so noted on the plan, or a security be provided to the Office of Community Development to guarantee that monumentation will be set with the added condition that monumentation will be set for each lot prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for said lot.
3. Prior to the signing of the subdivision plan, the plan also reflect any revisions required by the Town of Amherst.
4. Prior to the signing of the subdivision plan, conditional approval be obtained from the Town of Amherst.
5. The proposed Common Driveway Easement and Sewer Line Easement document be signed and recorded at the time the subdivision plan is recorded.
6. Driveway permits shall be required and approved by the Public Works Department for each new lot prior to the start of any site development on each new lot.
7. New Lot 23-3-3 shall have a Milford address.
8. A note be added to the plan stating that Lots 23-3-1, 23-3-2, and 23-3 are subject to Police and Library impact fees to be determined at the time of building permit application.

J. Langdell seconded and all in favor. Vote 6-0-0; motion carried unanimously.

Tammy J. Bole – Ruonala Rd – Map 52, Lot 83. Public hearing for a minor subdivision creating one (1) new residential lot.

Abutters present:

Len-Ann Rutherford, Ruonala Rd

Chairman Beer recognized:

Randy Haight, Meridian Land Services, Inc.

Tammy Bole, owner

Chairman Beer read the notice into the record and verified that the application was complete. S. Duncanson made a motion to accept the application. V. Bharucha seconded and all in favor. P. Amato made a motion that the application did not pose potential regional impact. J. Langdell seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

R. Haight presented plans dated 9/10/15 and explained the proposal to subdivide a 6.4 acre lot into two (2) residential lots. The existing house lot will keep 280 ft frontage on Ruonala Rd and the new lot will have 450ft of frontage on NH Rte 13S. Test pits were done and we have obtained State subdivision approval. We've also applied for a driveway permit from NH DOT. The sight distance and grade are excellent. There was a subdivision in 2004 that went to family and now the new owner is just subdividing the between the frontages. The proposed new lot will have forested wetlands with a small field and lawn. It also abuts the Roach Preserve to the north. There will be 72,000SF of contiguous dry land on the parent lot and 89,000SF of contiguous dry land on the new lot.

Chairman Beer opened discussion to the public; there being none, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

J. Langdell stated that this is and abuts a very environmentally sensitive area and inquired about the environmental coordinator's recommendations. B. Parker said they are notes containing additional information

that could be added to the plan but are not critical to the approval of the subdivision. R. Haight explained that the request is just to label the contours every two feet instead of ten feet, which is fine. As far as the concerns with the erosion control and sedimentation, we will have to submit for stormwater application because we can't build the house, the driveway and the septic under the threshold of 5,000 SF of disturbance. It is a good point to bring up, but this has to be addressed anyway once we know where the house footprint will go.

S. Duncanson made a motion to conditionally approve the application, subject to the recommendations from the staff report dated 10/20/15;

1. All lot monumentation be set and so noted on the plan, or a security be provided to the Office of Community Development to guarantee that monumentation will be set with the added condition that monumentation will be set for each lot prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for said lot.
2. The State Subdivision approval number be added to the plan.
3. A note be added that Town of Milford Library and Police impact fees will be required for any residential development on new lot 52/83-2.
4. The locus plan inset be corrected to read "Berkeley Place" instead of "Ball" and the spelling of "Berkley" on the 1"=50' plan sheets be revised to read "Berkeley".

P. Amato seconded and all in favor. Vote 6-0-0; motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Beer called for a five (5) minute recess. The meeting reconvened at 8:00PM.

Salt Creek Properties, LLC – South St – Map 43, Lot 20. Public hearing for a minor subdivision creating one (1) new commercial lot.

No abutters were present.

Chairman Beer recognized:

Dawn Tuomala, Monadnock Survey Inc.

Steven Desmarais, Salt Creek Properties, LLC

Chairman Beer read the notice into the record and verified that the application was complete. J. Langdell made a motion to accept the application. P. Amato seconded and all in favor. P. Amato made a motion that the application did not pose potential regional impact. J. Langdell seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

D. Tuomala presented plans dated 9/21/15 and gave an overview of the proposed subdivision to create a two (2) acre commercial lot on the conditionally approved new street named Nathaniel Dr. All conditions will be completed from the August, 2015 plan which will be submitted once the future municipal sewer and water have been added.

S. Duncanson inquired where the road would be. S. Desmarais said it would be located where the log pile is and would follow the stonewall.

P. Amato inquired if part of the new lot was in the Limited Commercial Business district. S. Desmarais said part was in the Commercial District and yes, part is in the Limited Commercial Business District. We've thought about this a lot and there most likely wouldn't be a commercial use building in the back part of the lot, but there will be parking, which is allowed in both districts. B. Parker said it is really the only way to utilize that lot and whatever is in that strip will have to comply or a variance will have to be obtained. P. Amato noted that would be a site plan issue and didn't pertain to this subdivision. J. Langdell added that it is straightforward provided that the conditionally approved plan is signed off on. S. Desmarais said we rushed this a little because we thought we had a use that would warrant this change, but it's not going to happen until spring.

Chairman Beer opened discussion to the public; there being none, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

S. Duncanson asked that the lot numbers be corrected to 43/20-2 and 43/20 on the staff memo and recommendations.

J. Langdell said it would be beneficial to have a long range plan for the development of this property. S. Desmarais said it took him twenty (20) years to get this piece of land and think about how the town has changed since then. I want a gas station, a Dunkin donuts a bank and a drug store, so find them for me and I'll file the plan tomorrow. When the time comes, the people will define what it's going to be. In back, it can be commercial or apartments. Hopefully it will be good business who'll hire a lot of employees, but I don't know what it will be.

S. Duncanson made a motion to conditionally approve the application, subject to the recommendations from the staff memo dated 10/20/15 and revisions to correct the lot numbers;

1. The plan "Subdivision and Lot Line Adjustment Plan of Land Lots 43-20, 43-20-1, 43-71, & 43-72" incorporate the conditions of approval from the August 18, 2015 Planning Board approval, be signed and recorded.
2. The current proposed plan "Minor Subdivision Plan of Land Lot 43-20 Salt Creek Properties, LLC", dated September 21, 2015, be revised to reflect the applicable plan information and notes from the to-be-recorded August 18, 2015 plan.
3. That the following notes be added to the current proposed plan "Minor Subdivision Plan of Land Lot 43-20 Salt Creek Properties, LLC":
 - a. Any future development of Lot 43/20 shall be served by municipal water and sewer.
 - b. Accurate zoning district delineations for Residence 'A', 'C'- Commercial, and 'LCB – Limited Commercial Business' be shown on the plan.

P. Amato seconded and all in favor. Vote 6-0-0; motion carried unanimously.

Robert Lamattina and Salt Creek Properties, LLC – Hammond Rd – Map 43, Lots 72 & 73. Public hearing for a lot line adjustment
No abutters were present.

Chairman Beer recognized:
Ray Shea, Sandford Surveying & Engineering, Inc.
Steve Desmarais, Salt Creek Properties, LLC
Robert Lamattina, Tokyo Joe's

Chairman Beer read the notice into the record and verified that the application was complete. P. Amato made a motion to accept the application. V. Bharucha seconded and all in favor. P. Amato made a motion that the application did not pose potential regional impact. J. Langdell seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

R. Shea presented plans dated 9/15/15 and described the affected lots associated with the proposed lot line adjustment. The purpose is to move 2.626 acres from lot 43/73 to lot 43/72 making it less non-conforming with 9.5 acres and an extra 115 ft of frontage. There will be no other changes on to the properties.

P. Amato inquired about the driveway to the old sheds. R. Shea said that the sheds were never on the property and will be gone. S. Desmarais said the driveway and easement had more to do with family use when the property was owned by the Willette's.

Chairman Beer opened discussion to the public; there being none, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

J. Langdell made a motion to conditionally approve the application, subject to the recommendation from the staff memo dated 10/20/15 that;

1. This site plan amendment is contingent on the approval of the Lot Line Adjustment application referenced earlier in this staff report.

P. Amato seconded and all in favor. Vote 6-0-0; motion carried unanimously.

Robert Lamattina/Tokyo Joe's Studio – Hammond Rd – Map 43, Lot 73. Public hearing for a site plan amendment to re-configure the parking area.

No abutters were present.

Chairman Beer recognized:

Ray Shea, Sandford Surveying & Engineering, Inc.

Steve Desmarais, Salt Creek Properties, LLC

Robert Lamattina, Tokyo Joe's

Chairman Beer read the notice into the record and verified that the application was complete. P. Amato made a motion to accept the application. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor. J. Langdell made a motion that the application did not pose potential regional impact. P. Amato seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

R. Shea presented plans dated 9/17/15 and gave an overview of the proposed amendment to realign the parking. We are proposing to move three (3) of the six (6) spaces and create a circular drive for a net increase of eight (8) spaces. We will be going from eighteen (18) to twenty-one (21) spaces to lessen and alleviate the congestion when students are being dropped off and picked up. The drive and parking will continue to be gravel. There will be no change to the house or the business.

J. Langdell inquired about the proposed low water quality pool. R. Shea explained that it will function like a retention pond. There will be 3,000 SF of additional parking area so we wanted to show the grassy area where water will drain into, settle and go into the ground; it is considered drainage control. We also show silt fencing on the plan but will replace that with wattles. J. Langdell inquired about staff comments regarding concerns with drinking water. B. Parker said he didn't know anything more. R. Shea said there is an offsite well which is an adequate water source and in the future, we would hope to tie into the municipal water. R. Lamattina said we use spring water for the studio and the tenant in the house has never had a problem; however, we had tenants in the apartment who tried to use the water as an excuse to get of paying rent but the judge vindicated me. S. Desmarais added that there's also a backup well. R. Shea said there are two approved leach fields that were shown on the 2009 site plan.

Chairman Beer opened discussion to the public; there being none, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

J. Langdell asked if the erosion control plan will be amended. R. Shea said we can use ground stump chips or wattles instead of the silt fence, whichever Fred Elkind approves and we will change the plan accordingly.

P. Amato made a motion to conditionally approve the application, subject to the following staff recommendations from the memo dated 10/20/15 that;

1. This site plan amendment is contingent on the approval of the Lot Line Adjustment application for lots 43/72 and 43/73,
2. The erosion control and detail plan sheet be amended if necessary to reflect any revisions from the Planning Board meeting.

S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor. Vote 6-0-0; motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS:

The next worksession date was changed from 11/3/15 to Tuesday 11/10/15.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30PM on a motion by S. Duncanson and seconded by J. Langdell.

Motion to approve: Steve Duncanson

Seconded by: Janet Langdell